



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/082,398

02/25/2002

Salim G. Kara

61135/P004CP1CP1C2/101074

5850

29053

7590

07/26/2006

DALLAS OFFICE OF FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
2200 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 2800
DALLAS, TX 75201-2784

EXAMINER

BROOKS, MATTHEW L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3629

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/082,398	Applicant(s) KARA, SALIM G.	
	Examiner Matthew L. Brooks	Art Unit 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-16, 19-25 and 27-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-16, 19-25 and 27-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1, 4-16, 19-25 and 27-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sansone et al. (4,831,555) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Schuessler (2,964,232).

Sansone teaches software and computer system for generation and printing of a postal item/correspondence and postage indicia thereon, said indicia being machine readable. (Column 2, 1-23 and Column 3, 1-12 and Column 4, 10-15 and C 4 30-55). Sansone further teaches that the computer used is the personal computer is attached to a regular printer (Column 3, 1-7) and that the postage may be printed directly upon a block insert that would be viewable through a window type envelope.

Art Unit: 3629

Sansone fails to teach what type of windowed envelope may be used.

Schuessler discloses the envelop as claimed, and that the insertion of a completed document inserted therein. Furthermore, envelope 31 with a front surface that contains three windows 33, 34 & 35, that are covered with glassine, that is cellophane 36, where cellophane 36 protects the contents 10 of envelope 31 while permitting the underlying portions of contents 10 to be viewed from the outside of envelope 31. It is further noted that covered windows 33, 34 & 35 are positioned on the front of envelope 31 such that when:

- A) sender/return address 16,27;
- B) addressee/recipient address 15,26; and
- C) postmark 17,304

which have been printed as part of contents 10 so that when contents 10 has been properly folded and inserted into envelope 31, then the addressee/recipient address 15,26 is clearly viewable through covered window 33 in the lower left portion of envelope 31; the sender/return address 16,27 is clearly viewable through covered window 34 in the upper left portion of envelope 31; and the postmark 17,30 is clearly viewable through covered window 35 in the upper right portion of envelope 31.

Further still, Shuessler teaches the use of a windowed envelope as claimed as a convenient method/system/ and apparatus for use in a mailing system and method as being a convenience to insert a prior prepared document /correspondence into. The business practice of using windowed envelopes for the insertion of an all-inclusive mailing, which allows relevant portions to be

Art Unit: 3629

displayed, is an old and well-established business practice. This practice is designed to be cost/and time saving by eliminating the need to print on envelopes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the Sansone method of document and postage indicia generation by software and computer system, the insertion of a fully prepared document (indicia/return address/sender/ and letter content) into a windowed envelope as taught by Schussler, along the lines of the principles established above.

The Sansone reference discloses all of the system components and software required in order to carry out the invention. Sansone arguably does not discuss the "simultaneous printing" of indicial and correspondence as claimed. In determining the obviousness of applying what is generally known in the envelope industry to what is known in the world of computer processing one must determine the level of ordinary skill (*Dann v. Johnston*, 425 U.S. 219, 189 USPQ 257 (1976)). The envelop industry, particularly the three window envelope, to one of ordinary skill in the art, for sometime now is recognized as a great vehicle to transfer a letter via mail, allowing pertinent addressing informaton to show through while still protecting the document. Also, the computer processing industry, imparicularly letter writing has utilized computers and printers for years to generate correspondence and in doing so have combined programs on computers to make all types of documents and simultaneously print. For example take a jpeg. and into a letter, type said letter and print. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 3629

invention to have utilized the teachings of Sansone to generate said postage on ones personal computer, copy and paste into document and then press print which would simultaneously produce completed correspondence. The desirability to do this is clearly to save a customer the time of printing a document once and then printing up postage again. Then to take the completed document and place in three window envelope was known as taught in Shussler.

NOTE:

A) it is noted that as would be clearly understood by one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention, both a postage indicia and a cancelled postage stamp provide the same function, that is they each provide proof of the payment of an amount of postage, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that these items are in fact equivalent representations of the same thing.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 4/28/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to pg 8, 2nd full P, Sansone teaches the method may be accomplished via all types of computers including a personal computer that can generate a postage on to a mail piece. Certainly It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to same said personal computer to generate a letter/postal item.

Art Unit: 3629

In response to pg 8, last full P, Sansone teaches the method may be accomplished via all types of computers including a personal computer that can generate a postage on to a mail piece. Certainly It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to same said personal computer to generate a correspondence/letter/postal item.

In response to pg 9, first full P, Sansone teaches the method may be accomplished via all types of computers including a personal computer that can generate a postage on to a mail piece. Certainly It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to same said personal computer to generate a correspondence/letter/postal item.

5. In response to pg 11, 1st full P, Applicant appears to be asserting that Sansone fails to teach "machine readable". Examiner first states that virtually everything is technically machine readable. Examiner also points Applicant to reference portions which teach machine readable; ie; Column 3, 1-12 "bar code".

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

Art Unit: 3629


action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew L. Brooks whose telephone number is (571) 272-8112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday; 8 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-8112. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

1/18/06
MLB


JOHN W. HAYES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER